

positive results, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2350. ●

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, Every American has a great stake in the National Institutes of Health. NIH is the foremost medical research center in the world. Sixty percent of all health research in the United States is conducted by NIH scientists or grantees under NIH direction. NIH-supported scientists have won 78 Nobel Prizes. NIH is conducting research on a wide range of medical problems, including heart disease, allergies, infectious disease, senility, mental retardation, arthritis, and Reye's syndrome.

I hope we will soon see the day when the NIH bill is not a battleground in Congress. Society has a moral obligation to insure that people have the best health possible. No value we hold is more important than good health. H.R. 2350, before us today, commits \$4.5 billion from the Federal Treasury to the eradication of disease, sickness, and suffering. This, in my view, is one of the wisest expenditures to taxpayers dollars.

The Subcommittee on Health, on which I serve, has developed a bill that responds to many health problems of our society. The bill emphasizes new research strategies to address compelling health problems, and continues current research efforts. Several features deserves to be highlighted:

The bill directs new emphasis on prevention of disease, recognizing that maintaining good health is more prudent and cost-effective than correcting poor health and curing disease.

The bill directs NIH to do a study on the adequacy of future health care personnel to deal with the growing aging population. Hearings before our subcommittee revealed that few health professionals receive adequate training in the mental and physical problems of the elderly, yet the number of people over 65 is expected to double by 2020.

We have included prur's disease, a condition affecting almost 1 million Americans at a cost of \$20 billion a year in nursing home care.

H.R. 2350 includes a sizable increase for the National Cancer Institute, continuing our Nation's "War on Cancer," a most dreaded disease too familiar to almost everyone.

Our legislation would create a new National Institute for Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Diseases, which we hope will bring some focus to a problem suffered by over 37 million Americans (including 250,000 children) and costing over \$30 billion a year in health care expenditures, lost wages, disability payments, and lost tax revenues.

The bill includes language to encourage the development of research methods not using animals to reduce costs and to reduce the thousands of

animals now consumed in research. The bill has a specific provision prohibiting interference with research methods. Importantly, the bill directs NIH to establish minimum guidelines on the use of animals in research.

As the author of the animal care and alternatives provisions, I would like to offer some perspective.

These provisions evolved from over 2 years of efforts in two committees and from extensive discussions and negotiations with scientists, researchers, college and university officials, Government officials, and animal care organizations.

To meet the concerns expressed, particularly by the university community, these provisions were significantly changed from the legislation developed in the previous Congress. Most importantly, no provision for accreditation of laboratory facilities has been included in this legislation. We reduced the animal care committees' reporting requirements. We removed all language that might suggest that the committee make judgments about the appropriateness of research methods. We stipulated that standards of animal care and treatment being the form of guidelines, not regulations, to avoid any duplicative or conflicting standards under other laws and to encourage NIH to build on guidelines currently in use. We have included a requirement that committee members be appointed by the institution itself.

Our hearings revealed that two out of three research institutions now have animal care committees. Testimony also revealed that the cost of complying with the animal care committee requirement would be minimal since serving on the committees currently in existence is frequently voluntary. Most major universities now have a "lay" or outside person on their animal care committees. The requirements of this bill, therefore, are not a dramatic departure for responsible institutions since the requirements are not really "new." What we have done is to give a uniform, consistent, legal underpinning for what is largely current practice. The words of several medical college deans put it this way:

Your amendment addresses the primary issues raised by those concerned with humane animal care and are consistent with our institutional policies on this matter.

The changes contained in your amendment are not cumbersome and are generally consonant with current policy and practice in our animal care programs. I fully appreciate your diligent efforts in resolving our original concerns over prior language on this subject.

The proposed new provisions create requirements that are very close to our current practices.

It is my belief that the animal care provisions of this bill represent a reasonable balance between the interests of quality research and good animal welfare. Good research involving ani-

mals depends on good animal care. Responsible institutions have no need to worry. My goal in developing these provisions has never been in redress or reaction to widespread abuse of animals. Occasionally incidents do occur, but they are occasional. My goal has been to create a framework—particularly through local, institutionally-appointed animal care committees—for stimulating discussion on appropriate animal care in hopes of guiding future developments in this area to reflect the proper sensitivity to animals, whatever that sensitivity may be.

It is impossible for anybody—legislative, executive, or private—to make a judgment about which health problem deserves the most money or the most attention. Quite simply, they all do. I am distressed that the Reagan administration's budget and economic policies leave us with so little money to try to eradicate disease and suffering for our people.

President Reagan asked Congress for a 15-percent increase in the 1984 budget for the military, but 1.8 percent for health research. He asked for \$4 billion for health research in 1 year and at the same time requested \$94 billion for arms, or \$1 billion a day for the next 3 years for defense. This administration has doubled the military budget since 1980, but kept the lid tight on NIH funding increases. It is a logic hard to follow since there has been no decrease in disease and sickness or decrease in our population. It is hard to come up with what the numbers should be, but I do know that the priorities of this administration are completely out of whack when it comes to health care. I hope my colleagues will approve the NIH extension bill, which will give a little hope to our people that they can live their lives without fear of disease and debilitation. ●

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, today in Congress we can offer a ray of hope for the millions of Americans who are suffering from the crippling disease of arthritis.

Today, we have a chance to pass legislation, the Health Research Extension Act, which includes a provision for the creation of a separate National Institute of Arthritis. I would like to give credit to my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, CLAUDE PEPPER, who got the ball rolling on this important piece of legislation and has done so much to enhance the quality of life for one of our most vulnerable populations—our Nation's elderly.

There are many compelling reasons for creating a separate institute.

Arthritis is the most common crippling disability and mankind's oldest known chronic illness. Over 37 million Americans, old and young alike suffer

from among over 100 types of arthritis.

Even though tens of millions of Americans suffer from this debilitating disease, only 17 percent of all research dollars at the National Institutes of Health, are spent on arthritis research.

While our investment is small the costs to society are enormous. The economic costs to the Nation in terms of health care services and lost productivity exceed \$17 billion annually.

The statistics are mind boggling:

Twenty percent of medicare hospital costs are attributable to arthritis, one-half of all workers' compensation claims, and social security disability benefits and lost tax revenues account for the remaining fiscal burden we bear as long as this disease remains untreated.

Arthritis is second only to circulatory diseases in economic costs to society.

Failure to establish this institute would be pennywise and pound foolish.

Arthritis costs society billions each year and yet scientific research has been put on the back burner at NIH, while quack cures proliferate.

In establishing this Institute, existing management and facilities can be consolidated creating more focused research activities and a more efficient utilization of resources.

If arthritis research is to be given an adequate priority among the competing interests for research support, creation of a national research institute is critical.

It is time we raised the level of Federal support for arthritis research, so that it is commensurate with the profound national and economic impact associated with this disease.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation which can bring a ray of hope for millions of Americans, young and old alike, who are battling this crippling disease. ●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the provisions for animal protection embodied in the reauthorization for NIH.

The first provision authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to arrange for the conduct of a study by the Institute of Medicine regarding the use of animals in behavioral and biomedical research within 18 months of enactment of the bill.

The second provision requires that each facility that receives research funds from NIH have an internal Animal Care Committee. This requirement for a functional Animal Care Committee is intended to increase institutional accountability for the maintenance of animals used in research. Many facilities already have such committees. This provision would provide assurance that every institu-

tion would have an appropriately constituted and functional committee.

The third provision directs NIH to systematically develop alternatives to the use of animals in research and testing. The development of alternatives is now being done by private industry and by privately funded university programs. Alternative methods are not only more humane, they are faster, cheaper, and often more reliable than using animals.

The Government is now using approximately 45 million animals a year, including primates, dogs, cats, rabbits, and other species, and spending between \$2 and \$3 billion a year for research using these animals. It would be inhumane and fiscally irresponsible not to develop alternatives to animal use.

These animal provisions are a progressive step. I urge your support of them. ●

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ) having assumed the chair, Mr. BREUX, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2350) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities under that act relating to the National Institutes of Health and the National Research Institutes, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 208, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Chandler amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's motion at this time comes too late and is not in order under the rule providing for consideration of this bill.

At this point the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

□ 2110

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will defer to the will of the House. I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material in the RECORD, on the subject of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2350, HEALTH RESEARCH EXTENSION ACT OF 1983

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and make other technical corrections so as to reflect adoption of the amendments on the bill, H.R. 2350, the Health Research Extension Act of 1983, just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 826

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 826, a bill sponsored by Congressman KOST-MAYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.